

1 BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General  
of the State of California  
2 SHERRY L. LEDAKIS, State Bar No. 131767  
Deputy Attorney General  
3 California Department of Justice  
110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100  
4 San Diego, CA 92101  
P.O. Box 85266  
5 San Diego, CA 92186-5266  
Telephone: (619) 645-2078  
6 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061  
Attorneys for Complainant  
7

8 **BEFORE THE**  
**BOARD OF PHARMACY**  
9 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
10 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

12 ANTHONY D. PHAM

13 Respondent.

Case No. 2852

OAH No.

**DEFAULT DECISION  
AND ORDER**

[Gov. Code, §11520]

14  
15  
16 FINDINGS OF FACT

17 1. On or about May 13, 2005, Complainant Patricia F. Harris, in her official  
18 capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, filed Accusation No. 2852 against  
19 Anthony D. Pham (Respondent) before the Board of Pharmacy.

20 2. On or about June 30, 2004, the (Board) issued Pharmacy Technician  
21 Registration No. TCH 57172 to Respondent. The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full  
22 force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December  
23 31, 2005, unless renewed.

24 3. On or about May 24, 2005, Carrie L. Johnson, an employee of the  
25 Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of Accusation No. 2852,  
26 Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code  
27 sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which  
28 was and is 16187 Cache Street, Fountain Valley, CA 92708. A copy of the Accusation, the

1 related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as exhibit A, and are incorporated  
2 herein by reference.

3 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the  
4 provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

5 5. On or about June 10, 2005, the aforementioned documents were returned  
6 by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Unclaimed." A copy of the postal returned documents are  
7 attached hereto as exhibit B, and are incorporated herein by reference.

8 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

9 "(c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent  
10 files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the  
11 accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of  
12 respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing."

13 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service  
14 upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of  
15 Accusation No. 2852.

16 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

17 "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the  
18 hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or  
19 upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to  
20 respondent."

21 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board  
22 finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on  
23 Respondent's express admissions by way of default and the evidence before it, contained in  
24 exhibits A, B and C, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 2852 are true.

25 DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

26 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Anthony D. Pham has  
27 subjected his Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH 57172 to discipline.

28 ///

1           2.     A copy of the Accusation and the related documents and Declaration of  
2 Service are attached.

3           3.     The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

4           4.     The Board is authorized to revoke Respondent's Pharmacy Technician  
5 Registration based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation:

6                   **July 27, 2004, Conviction for Petty Theft Orange County**

7                           **Superior Court Case No. 04WM04062**

8           5.     On February 3, 2004, Anthony D. Pham, respondent, entered Rite-Aid  
9 located in Orange County, California. Respondent took and later admitted to stealing the  
10 personal property of Rite-Aid.

11           6.     On April 23, 2004, the Orange County District Attorney filed a  
12 misdemeanor complaint entitled, *The People of the State of California vs. Anthony D. Pham*,  
13 Case No. 04WM04602.

14           7.     On July 27, 2004, in Case No. 04WM04602, respondent pled guilty to  
15 violating Penal Code section 488-484(a), Petty Theft, a misdemeanor, and was ordered to pay a  
16 fine of \$200, pay restitution of \$100 and was placed on three years informal probation.

17                   **August 19, 2004, Conviction for Possession of Controlled Substance Paraphernalia,**  
18                           **Orange County Superior Court Case No. 04WM08041**

19           8.     On July 4, 2004, the Orange Police Department stopped respondent for  
20 questioning and learned that respondent was on probation and subject to search. The officers  
21 searched respondent and found a set of car keys. Subsequently, they asked him where his car  
22 was and respondent pointed it out to the officers. The officers asked respondent if they could  
23 search his car. Respondent consented to the search. Inside respondent's car, the officers seized a  
24 white beanie containing three glass pipes commonly used for smoking illegal narcotics. The  
25 officers also seized a metal tin containing several small zip lock baggies which are commonly  
26 used to transport illegal narcotics. Under questioning, respondent admitted to using illegal drugs.  
27 One of the glass pipes contained residue of illegal drug usage.

28     ///



1 Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a  
2 hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

3 This Decision shall become effective on September 22, 2005.

4 It is so ORDERED August 23, 2005

5  
6 BOARD OF PHARMACY  
7 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
8 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

8 70031856.wpd  
9 DOJ docket number:SD2005700364

By   
STANLEY W. GOLDENBERG  
Board President

10 Attachments:

- 11 Exhibit A: Accusation No.2852, Related Documents, and Declaration of Service
- 12 Exhibit B: Postal Return Documents
- 13 Exhibit C: Declaration of Sherry L. Ledakis

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Exhibit A  
Accusation No. 2852,  
Related Documents and Declaration of Service

1 BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General  
of the State of California  
2 SHERRY L. LEDAKIS, State Bar No. 131767  
Deputy Attorney General  
3 California Department of Justice  
110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100  
4 San Diego, CA 92101

5 P.O. Box 85266  
San Diego, CA 92186-5266  
6 Telephone: (619) 645-2078  
Facsimile: (619) 645-2061

7 Attorneys for Complainant

8  
9 **BEFORE THE**  
**BOARD OF PHARMACY**  
10 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 2852

12 ANTHONY D. PHAM

OAH No.

13 16187 Cache Street  
14 Fountain Valley, CA 92708

**ACCUSATION**

15 Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH  
57172

16 Respondent.

17  
18 Complainant alleges:

19 **PARTIES**

20 1. Patricia Harris (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official  
21 capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.

22 2. On or about June 30, 2004, the Board of Pharmacy issued Pharmacy  
23 Technician Registration No. TCH 57172 to Anthony D. Pham (Respondent). Said license will  
24 expire on December 31, 2005, unless renewed.

25 **JURISDICTION**

26 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board),  
27 Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section  
28 references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

1                   4.       Section 4301 of the Code states:

2                   The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of  
3 unprofessional conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation  
4 or issued by mistake. Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of  
5 the following:

6                   . . . . .  
7                   (f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty,  
8 fraud, deceit, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a  
9 licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.

10                  . . . . .  
11                  (j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state or of the United States  
12 regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.

13                  . . . . .  
14                  (i) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications,  
15 functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. The record of conviction of a  
16 violation of Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States  
17 Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state  
18 regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of  
19 unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive  
20 evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the  
21 circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order to fix the degree of  
22 discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous  
23 drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the  
24 qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of  
25 guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction  
26 within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for  
27 appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an  
28 order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a  
subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to  
withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the  
verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment.

19                  . . . . .  
20                  (p) Actions or conduct that would have warranted denial of a license.

21                   5.       Section 4300 of the Code states:

22                   (a) Every license issued may be suspended or revoked.

23                   (b) The board shall discipline the holder of any license issued by the board,  
24 whose default has been entered or whose case has been heard by the board and found  
25 guilty, by any of the following methods:

26                   (1) Suspending judgment.

27                   (2) Placing him or her upon probation.

28                   (3) Suspending his or her right to practice for a period not exceeding one  
year.

(4) Revoking his or her license.

(5) Taking any other action in relation to disciplining him or her as the  
board in its discretion may deem proper.

1                   6.       Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the

2 suspension/expiration/surrender/cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of

1 jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may  
2 be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

3 7. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may  
4 request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or  
5 violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation  
6 and enforcement of the case.

7 **Alleged Facts:**

8 **July 27, 2004, Conviction for Petty Theft Orange County**  
9 **Superior Court Case No. 04WM04062**

10 8. On February 3, 2004, Anthony D. Pham, respondent, entered Rite-Aid  
11 located in Orange County, California. Respondent took and later admitted to stealing the  
12 personal property of Rite-Aid.

13 9. On April 23, 2004, the Orange County District Attorney filed a  
14 misdemeanor complaint entitled, *The People of the State of California vs. Anthony D. Pham*,  
15 Case No. 04WM04602.

16 10. On July 27, 2004, in Case No. 04WM04602, respondent pled guilty to  
17 violating Penal Code section 488-484(a), Petty Theft, a misdemeanor, and was ordered to pay a  
18 fine of \$200, pay restitution of \$100 and placed on three years informal probation.

19 **August 19, 2004, Conviction for Possession of Controlled Substance Paraphernalia,**  
20 **Orange County Superior Court Case No. 04WM08041**

21 11. On July 4, 2004, the Orange Police Department stopped respondent for  
22 questioning and learned that respondent was on probation and subject to search. The officers  
23 searched respondent and found a set of car keys. Subsequently, they asked him where his car  
24 was and respondent pointed it out to the officers. The officers asked respondent if they could  
25 search his car. Respondent consented to the search. Inside respondent's car, the officers seized a  
26 white beanie containing three glass pipes commonly used for smoking illegal narcotics. The  
27 officers also seized a metal tin containing several small zip lock baggies which are commonly  
28 used to transport illegal narcotics. Under questioning, respondent admitted to using illegal drugs.  
One of the glass pipes contained residue of illegal drug usage.



1 substance paraphernalia which constitutes conduct that would have warranted the denial of a  
2 pharmacy technician's license as set forth in paragraphs 8 through 13 above.

3 **PRAYER**

4 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein  
5 alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

6 1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy Technician Registration No. TCH  
7 57172, issued to Anthony D. Pham.

8 2. Ordering Anthony D. Pham to pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable  
9 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions  
10 Code section 125.3;

11 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

12 DATED: 5/13/05  
13

14 *P. J. Harris*  
15 PATRICIA HARRIS  
16 Executive Officer  
17 Board of Pharmacy  
18 Department of Consumer Affairs  
19 State of California  
20 Complainant


21  
22  
23  
24  
25 SD2005700069  
70019666.wpd

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Exhibit B  
Postal Return Documents

ATTORNEY GENERAL  
SAN DIEGO

2005 JUN 15 AM 8:53




7160 3901 9848 8027 9224

RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL  
110 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1100  
P.O. BOX 85286  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92186-5286

Anthony D. Pham  
16187 Cache Street  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708



5/26/05  
5/31/05  
6/10/05

CA

HIMESLER 615

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Exhibit C  
Certification of Costs

1 BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General  
of the State of California  
2 SHERRY L. LEDAKIS, State Bar No. 131767  
Deputy Attorney General  
3 California Department of Justice  
110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100  
4 San Diego, CA 92101  
P.O. Box 85266  
5 San Diego, CA 92186-5266  
Telephone: (619) 645-2078  
6 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061  
Attorneys for Complainant  
7

8 **BEFORE THE**  
**BOARD OF PHARMACY**  
9 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**  
10 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

12 ANTHONY D. PHAM

13 Respondent.

Case No. 2852  
OAH No.

**CERTIFICATION OF COSTS:**  
**DECLARATION OF SHERRY L.**  
**LEDAKIS**

[Business and Professions Code section  
125.3]

14  
15  
16  
17 I, SHERRY L. LEDAKIS, hereby declare and certify as follows:

18 1. I am a Deputy Attorney General employed by the California Department of  
19 Justice (DOJ), Office of the Attorney General (Office). I am assigned to the Licensing Section in  
20 the Civil Division of the Office. I have been designated as the representative to certify the costs  
21 of prosecution by DOJ and incurred by the Board of Pharmacy in this case. I make this  
22 certification in my official capacity and as an officer of the court.

23 2. I represent the Complainant, Patricia F. Harris, Executive Officer of the  
24 Board of Pharmacy, in this action. I was assigned to handle this case on or around March 28,  
25 2005.

26 3. As the Deputy Attorney General assigned to handle this case, I performed  
27 a wide variety of tasks that were necessary for the prosecution of this matter, including, but not  
28 limited to (1) conducting an initial case evaluation; (2) obtaining, reading and reviewing the

